

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04

A telephonic interview in the above-referenced case was conducted on January 12, 2007 between the Examiner and Terrence Wong. The Office Action mailed on September 22, 2006 was discussed. Specifically, the rejections of claims 1 and 35 in light of Adachi and Knockeart et. al. and the proposed amendments set forth herein were discussed with the intent to place the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal.

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 35 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-35 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Adachi and also as being anticipated by Knockeart et. al. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Adachi discloses efficiently producing traffic information based on the 'road geometry data' and 'event location data.' Knockeart discloses a vehicle information system which guides an operator along a calculated route. Neither Adachi nor Knockeart teach or imply:

“assigning a priority for transmission to a first data, wherein the first data includes a first road segment having a first segment first endpoint and a first segment second endpoint;

assigning a priority for transmission to a second data, wherein the second data includes a second road segment having a second segment first endpoint and a second segment second endpoint;

assigning a priority for transmission to a third data, wherein the third data includes a speed data associated with the first road segment;

transmitting to a plurality of receivers the third data based at least in part on the priority for transmission of the third data;

transmitting to a plurality of receivers the first data based at least in part on the priority for transmission of the first data; and

transmitting to a plurality of receivers the second data road segment based at least in part on the priority for transmission of the second data, wherein the first segment and the second segment are combined together to form a portion of the digital map.”

as amended claim 1 now discloses. It is therefore believed that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-34 depend from claim 1 and therefore are believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

Similarly, with regard to claim 35, neither Adachi nor Knockeart teach or imply:

“receiving from a transmitter a first data, wherein the first data includes a speed data associated with a first road segment and wherein the first data was transmitted based at least in part on an assigned priority for the first data;

receiving from the transmitter a second data, wherein the second data includes the first road segment having a first segment first endpoint and a first segment second endpoint and wherein the second data was transmitted based at least in part on an assigned priority for the second data; and

receiving from the transmitter a second data, wherein the second data includes the second road segment having a second segment first endpoint and a second segment second endpoint and wherein the second data was transmitted based at least in part on an assigned priority for the second data and wherein the first segment and the second segment are combined together to form a portion of the digital map.”

as amended claim 35 now discloses. It is therefore believed that claim 35 is allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/31/07

Laura Ing
Laura Ing
Registration No. 56,859
V 408-973-2581
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014